



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/719,430	11/21/2003	Hiroshi Furumichi	552MC	3411
27752	7590 01/24/2005		EXAM	INER
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE			BASICHAS, ALFRED	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3749	
CINCINNATI	CINCINNATI, OH 45224		DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		つ
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/719,430	FURUMICHI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alfred Basichas	3749
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a range. In the statutory minimum of thire statutory minimum of thire statutory minimum of the statutory of the	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	<u> 2 September 2004</u> .	
<i>'</i> <u>−</u>	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	•	•
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.L	0. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the applicating 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyarrection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/24/04. 	Paper No(s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/719,430 Page 2

Art Unit: 3749

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Perry (3,865,117), which shows all of the claimed limitations. Perry shows, among other things a trigger mechanism for initiating a phase change in a variable liquid element comprising a variable liquid element (see at least background of invention) enclosed in a container having at least one wall (see at least col. 5, line 60 col. 6, line 4), an activation material located external to the wall of the container (see at least col. 5, lines 5-13), at least one perforation in the container wall 48,58, wherein the perforation is a puncture, a hole, a slit, a crack, a crevice, or any combination thereof, a movable barrier means 38 for bringing the activation material into contact with the perforation, wherein the movable barrier means isolates the activation material from the perforation so that the phase change in the variable liquid element is not activated until the movable barrier means is initiated by a user, wherein the movable barrier means further comprises a folded tab wherein the activation material is printed, coated (as shown in the figures, the

Art Unit: 3749

activation material abuts and coats a portion of the movable barrier), sprayed, or any combination thereof, onto the folded tab, and wherein the folded tab is externally connected (see at least fig. 1) to the container over the perforation and the folded tab isolates the activation material from the perforation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 3749

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Page 4

- 6. Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry (3,865,117), which discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations. Perry does not specifically recite that the container further contains a product, that the phase change in the variable liquid element provides a temperature change to the product, or that the variable liquid element is a supercooled salt solution.
 - a. As regards the product, Official Notice is given that such devices for use with and containing products to be heated is old and well known in the art. Such an arrangement has the clear and obvious benefit of providing for effective heating of liquids and solids such as foodstuff and the like. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the claimed arrangement into the invention disclosed by Perry, so as to provide for heating of foodstuff and the like.
 - b. As regards the supercooled salt solution, Official Notice is given that such a solution is old and well known in the art. Such an arrangement has the clear and obvious benefit of providing for effective chemical reaction with an activation agent to produce heat. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the claimed arrangement into the invention disclosed by Perry, so as to provide for effective generation of heat.

Application/Control Number: 10/719,430 Page 5

Art Unit: 3749

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 703 306 3476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on 703 308 1935. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872 9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0861.

January 13, 2005

A**///∕é**d/Basichas Primary Examiner 703 306 3476